

Appl. No.: 10/775,833
Amdt. dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office action of August 2, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 19 2008

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

IN THE CLAIMS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellison-Taylor (US 5,796,402) in view of Durrani et al. (US 6,057,840). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertions.

Applicant's present invention provides a method that increases screen space of a computing device by using semi-transparent functional areas that overlap non-functional content areas on the screen. This method allows for relatively large functional targets on the screen--thus mitigating the usability problems associated with tiny buttons and other images--while also allowing the underlying content on the screen to be clearly visible. A main design feature of this invention is that two functional areas are never allowed to overlap. An overlap condition would cause user confusion as to which layer is active. Instead, the interface is designed to foreground functionality in all instances.

Ellison-Taylor discloses a computer system aligns windows on a computer screen in a manner that approximates the relative position and size of the windows as they were before being aligned. A preferred method aligns "opposing sides" of all pairs of windows (the nearest parallel sides of each pair of different windows) where such alignment can take place without creating overlaps among any of the windows. The aligned windows are then expanded to fill the bounding window in which they are provided by aligning the sides of the windows with adjacent sides of the bounding window.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Ellison-Taylor does not describe a display of functional images transparently positioned over functional images. Ellison-Taylor does not discuss or mention the transparent features of the present invention. In addition, Ellison-Taylor discusses avoiding overlapping images or the prioritizing features or ranking features claimed in the present invention. Ellison-Taylor arranges

Appl. No.: 10/775,833

Amdt. dated October 2, 2007

Reply to Office action of August 2, 2007

images by size, but not by frequency of use as asserted by the Examiner. The sections cited by the examiner step 308 and col. 2, lines 22-24 and Fig. 3 do not teach or describe any prioritizing of icons.

Durrani discloses a computer-implemented user interface having a semi-transparent scroll bar tool for increased screen usage. The present invention includes a user interface having one or more scroll bar tools displayed within a window area of a computer screen. The scroll bars are semi-transparent in that they allow the visualization of text and/or other graphical information that coincides in screen location with the scroll bars (e.g., "behind information"). Durrani describes the covering of non-functional images such as text from a document.

In order to sustain a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some teaching or suggestion of the elements in the claimed invention. Applicants submit that Ellison-Taylor in combination with Durrani does not teach or suggest the prioritizing and ranking features of Applicants' present invention. In addition, the combination of Ellison-Taylor and Durrani does not address the issue of displaying control images such that no functional control images simultaneously share any of the same space on the screen.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the art of record (alone or in combination) teaches, discloses or even suggests the invention as recited in each of Applicant's claims. Applicant further submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' present invention in present form is in condition for allowance. Applicants believe that no additional search should be required in view of the type of amendments Applicants made to the claims. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections and passage to issuance is respectfully requested.

No other fees are believed to be due. If Applicant is incorrect in this belief, please apply these charges or any credits, to Deposit Account 09-4447 (Reference Number ASU920030618US1).

Appl. No.: 10/775,833
Amdt. dated October 2, 2007
Reply to Office action of August 2, 2007

Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,



Darcell Walker
Reg. No. 34,945
P. O. Box 25048
Houston, Texas 77265
713-772-1255
October 2, 2007